



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,599	06/29/2001	Marcos Nogueira Novas	YOR920010318US1	6500
21254	7590	06/05/2006	EXAMINER	
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/893,599	NOVAES, MARCOS NOGUEIRA

Examiner  
Mohammad A. Siddiqi

Art Unit  
2154

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 21 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTO-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None

Claim(s) objected to: None

Claim(s) rejected: 6-8, 23-33, and 36.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 37-41

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**JOHN FOLLANSBEE**  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 16. Applicant's arguments filed 04/21/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, therefore rejections to claims 6-8, 23-33, and 36 is maintained. The claims 8 and 24 are rewritten in independent form and all the limitations of the claims have been addressed in previous final office action mailed 02/21/2006. Egger discloses determining coordinates for pages (col 6, lines 6-25) which are retrieved by a first user and mapping the coordinates (col 28, lines 2-5) into a space (col 6, lines 6-50); and based on said coordinates (col 36, lines 18-40) of said pages (col 48, lines 19-45), closeness of a research (col 5, lines 37-47, col 48, lines 63-67 and col 5, lines 38-48), Egger discloses wherein an intersection of research by said first and second users is graphically displayed to said first and second users (see abstract, col 5, lines 37-48). Anupam discloses informing a second user by first user (fig 1, col 1, lines 46-67 and col 2, lines 1-8; col 4, lines 24-32). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Anupam with Egger because it would provide user friendly computerized, web enabled, and an intelligent research tool that emulates human methods of research. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Examiner takes note the above Applicant's remark on page 12, "the claimed invention is www portal which is capable of correlating the usage habits of each human researcher and is capable of notifying a reaseracher of ..."; however, Applicant's remark could not be imported into the claim.

Applicant's election with traverse of the claims 37-44 in the reply filed on 04/21/2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground that: Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive because as mentioned in the previous office action, Following are the criteria for the restriction:

Claims 37-47 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: selectively notifying said second user of said closeness of said research being performed by said first user based on said determined coordinates of said pages which are retrieved by said first user. For applicant's aid claims 37-47 classified in 715/700. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 37-47 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03. Therefore the restriction requirement is still deemed proper and it is made Final.